

LETTERS to the EDITOR

Vets' action

To the Editor:
The Journal has, in the past three weeks, been bombarded with questions concerning the dismissal of UNCC professors. The faculty involved have, for the past three months, squeezed questions, past intimidations, to the Administration. To date, these inquiries have been ignored or, at best, the responses have been incomplete. It is time for students and faculty to meet and work together, to publicize the situation, and to lay the issues open for public review. In order to implement this coalition, an open meeting has been initiated by the UNCC Veterans' organization for February 16, in the University Center, Room 209. We feel that to shelve this series of incidents, which concerns the entire University Community is too much to ignore, too much to be satisfied with incomplete responses. Inquire with us.

UNCC Veterans

Power echoes

To the Editor:
Herein lie two reflections of a sociology major on the power structure at UNCC. These are not super-logical deductions but rather, exercises for the mind to dwell on.

Reflection one:
While strolling from the "Musical Shaft" toward the library one day after learning of Dr. Jordan's problem with the Administration, it occurred to me that (assuming that a university is a place where students are exposed to educative experiences) if the students ceased coming to the university, there would be no university; and if the faculty stopped coming out here, there would be no university; but, if the Administration didn't show up one day, no one would notice, or care. The irony in this little three-part scheme is that, of the three parts (students, faculty, and Administration) the students and faculty are the only people who don't have any damn power!

Reflection two:
Consider, if you will, the students as a chalice, the professors' dedicated guidance toward learning as wine, and the Administration as the proud director who raises the filled chalice for display. Now picture the chance occurrence that either the chalice and/or the wine disappears. This leaves the proud director (Administration) displaying either: (a) an empty cup, (b) a handful of wine, or (c) nothing, all of which look pretty stupid!

Happy Ballooning,
Col. H. Horstkocke Harrison,
CSAF, Ret.
(Actual name withheld by request.)

Jordan facts

To the Editor:
I would like to correct the impression given in the article entitled "Non-Renewal Angers Many" that Dr. Jordan is being persecuted for his political beliefs. As a person who has been a member of the Sociology Department from its establishment in the fall of 1969, I am thoroughly familiar with the events surrounding Dr. Jordan's case. The most immediate and apparent reason for his termination was — a disagreement based on — the nature of what the University Self-Study conducted in 1969-70 was to be. The initial issue was rather innocuous, and the entire department, with the exception of one man, was in support of Dr.

Jordan at that time. Despite this fact, he was given a letter of termination over this conflict. I feel that Dr. Jordan, being the oldest and most outspoken department member, except for the chairman, was made a scapegoat over the issue.

I would like to point out that there have been what I consider much more severe disagreements and conflicts, not involving Dr. Jordan, between other department members since that time, and none of these has resulted in the termination of anyone. Therefore, I am left with the impression that Dr. Jordan is the victim of a purely vindictive act.

I should also mention that the other party involved in this conflict has since left the university of his own accord. The impression I am left with, then, is that this vindictive act, committed against Dr. Jordan two-and-a-half years ago by a man, who is no longer even involved with the university, was an injustice at the time, is presently without rational grounds, and should be reviewed and reversed. By the way, Dr. Jordan is one of the most apolitical men I have ever known. He is a social theorist, and a good one, and would naturally mention all historical social philosophers in context of teaching social theory.

J.M. Watson
Instructor, Sociology
Department

Editor's note: We agree with the above and feel this is an accurate representation of the facts surrounding Dr. Jordan's dismissal. The question remains open whether this university is concerned with justice, freedom of speech, the right of lawful dissent or with prime manifestations of the petty, insidious "executive executions" that made the Inquisition such a bloody hit with a powerful and malevolent minority.

Aegean horseshit?

To the Editor:
As an interested party with access to the "Faculty Handbook" of this institution, which is based on the by-laws of the Board of Trustees which "have the effect of state law," I find that I must respond to Dr. McEniry's comments in the January 31 JOURNAL. In order to keep it short, I will address specific points.

The handbook says nothing about "maturity" or "immaturity" or even class attendance or counseling students as criteria for evaluating faculty. It does mention such things as progress toward degree, professional standing, publications, etc. It would appear that Dr. McEniry has taken it upon himself alone to interpret these by-laws so broadly as to render them entirely without meaning.

Are we to believe that, like Santa Clause, there is a "Mac the Knife" who has a list and is "checking it twice," to find out "who's naughty and nice?" Perhaps he even sends spies to keep track of professor's class attendance. Most professors don't even check students' attendance. Does the Administration send out dummy students to see how well professors "counsel" them? I must conclude

that Dr. McEniry is either setting up this argument as a "straw man" or he is incredibly pompous.

The article further states that a Ph.D. is usually required for tenure, and that after seven years, one must be granted tenure or leave. There are recent exceptions to both these "rules" in the Mathematics Department, in a field where the Ph.D. degree is readily available. This is an apparent act of discrimination.

Another statement was made to the effect that there is not "room" for all to have tenure in older universities. This university is hardly "old." Most departments have few if any full professors; some have none. There is demonstrably room at the "top." Further more, one does not have to be even an associate professor to receive tenure. Instructors have been given tenure, as in the case of the Math Department. One suspects that "circulation of the faculty" is a deliberate policy to keep down "the immature" or those who might prove not to be company "yes men."

Another statement is made to the effect that "each year" members of the department are polled to determine who will stay and who will be released. This polling is only advisory, as are all functions below the Chancellor's level, and can therefore be reversed by any higher official, quite apparently in violation of recent Federal Court decisions which state that a faculty member must be evaluated by his peers — those he works with.

As for the "soul searching" in determining reappointments, if a faculty of 250+ members is evaluated annually, then this leaves Dr. McEniry approximately two-thirds (2/3) day of "soul searching" per faculty member, assuming he does nothing else.

Another violation of Federal Law involves the failure to give reasons for dismissal of all faculty members. Most faculty may understand the

The Journal encourages its readers to write in response to items appearing in its pages. The Journal accepts all letters to the editor, provided they are typed or legibly printed and limited to a maximum of 300 words. All letters must be signed and bear the address and phone number of the writer.

The Journal reserves the right to edit all letters for libelous statements and good taste.

reasons for their dismissal as stated by Dr. McEniry, but those who do not know, or who, knowing the reasons, do not agree that they are adequate, are advised not to push the issue for fear of losing the essential letters of recommendation to the next institution. In other words, play our game and we'll pawn you off on someone else. Either the faculty member is worthy and is not renewed because of arbitrary reasons or he is not worthy and the reasons should be given him so he can correct these faults, pursue a new career or find a place where these particular "negative" traits are not considered important.

In any case, Federal Court decisions require that adequate reasons for dismissal be given faculty members. One wonders if "immaturity" would be considered an adequate reason. It is hardly a legal concept. Criticism of an Administration was not considered by a Federal Court to be a reason for dismissal, or "non-renewal," as the Administration prefers to call it.

One doubts that the secretiveness of the "due-process" connected with the faculty evaluation is to protect the faculty member, who is not told of the positive or negative nature of recommendations at any level. Rather, the secretiveness is apparently to prevent Administrators from having to face up to their decisions and display the maturity that an equitable handling of power requires. A faculty member may or may not know the charges against him, but, in no case, can he face his accuser. Even politicians must face the public nature of their voting records and speeches in

legislatures. These documents are not only available, but the law requires that they be published.

Another interesting point is the review procedure outlined by Dr. McEniry in the article. The "Faculty Manual," compiled and distributed by his office, mentions no appeals available to a faculty member above the member's chairman who is to then forward the appeal for him. Why is this information about other channels of appeal available only now, after a stink is raised, when it apparently was known to Dr. McEniry and others in high positions all along? Why was this information withheld from the faculty? "WE HAVE NO SECRETS HERE"

—Chancellor Colvard.

One wonders.

THE CENTAUR

(Actual name withheld by request.)

Sanskrit, Dobson dead?

To the Editor:
Where is Sanskrit? Did Michael Dobson die?

I understand Editor Dobson was funded over \$8,000 for four issues during this school year. So far, we have seen one summer issue which cost about \$1,800.

It disturbs me that Dobson, as editor, receives \$600 salary for two semesters while producing only one summer issue of Sanskrit.

Perhaps some students around here in responsible positions should be tarred and feathered for accepting a salary out of student fees, and then not producing. I recommend Michael Dobson be the first.

Further, if he has any inclination toward running for editor of Sanskrit again, I hope the students are well aware of his proven irresponsibility.

Disappointedlly,
Charlie Spriggs

Fear trek

To the Editor:
I am writing this letter because I am concerned for the safety of those who wander through the wooded area behind the Building and Grounds Complex. I have known for some time that hunters with hounds and guns pass regularly through the area. However, this weekend, I was involved in an incident which had more sinister implications.

After I left the cleared area above the athletic field, carrying my young child on a walk through the woods, I became aware of a group of approximately six large men who shouted what appeared to be a greeting from a distance behind me. After waving, I thought little more about them until I walked along the harshly-bending path in a more remote area, where suddenly I again heard their muffled voices.

As they narrowed the gap between us, they fanned out, disappearing into the woods on both sides of the path as if they were conducting the television rerun of a manhunt. I was forced, against my wishes to realize that my child and I were the potential victims of some sort of ridiculous ambush.

I have reason to believe that my knowledge of the area was all that allowed me to disappear and avoid a potentially very ugly incident. I would urge all members of the University Community to be aware of possible dangers in that area.

Name withheld by request

'Stirred me up'

To the Editor:
I am writing with reference to Ruby Smith's letter about UNCC's Homecoming Queen. I agree with Miss Smith. The picture in The Journal may have been a good

action shot but it was ridiculous because no one could even see Miss Pearson's face. In my opinion a good picture would include (at least) recognizable features of the new Queen.

My point is that UNCC students should be able to recognize their queen. They might want to congratulate her.

What stirred me up was your CURT answer to Miss Smith's letter of concern. And in the same paper your self-righteous letter on student apathy! Boy! What percentage of students at UNCC would it take to change your mind that the picture of Cora Pearson (if you could call it that) should be retaken?

Sincerely,
Linda L Griffin

Editor's note: Given UNCC as a base, two letters constitute overwhelming student interest in the matter and we agree that Miss Pearson should be identifiable for the students she serves. Please see page 3.

The old saying "self-righteousness is Nature's way of saying 'Hello stupid'" was never more richly deserved.

Jordan human

To the Editor:
When I heard of Dr. Jordan's dismissal, I was frustrated but not surprised. "What is the bureaucratic machine up to now?" I asked myself.

Dr. Jordan is qualified as a professor and a human being. These days, when students are sick and disgusted with the treatment from the Administration and from those professors who teach from a pedestal, Dr. Jordan's ways are refreshing and comforting.

UNCC is becoming the victim of the money-segments (status quo) of high institutions who are at home with an impersonal education.

It is time to humanize education; is time for a greater number of Leonard Jordans, not less.

Jose R. Bravo

"Spring election schedule"

February 9&10, 1972 — Nominations for the following offices: a. President; b. Vice President; c. Student Union Board (7 seats); d. Six (6) Senate seats (nominations made by legislators on Feb. 7, 1972; for 12 people.)

February 23 & 24, 1972 — Elections for previously nominated offices.

February 28 & 29, 1972 — Nominations for the following offices: a. Editor's of the Newspaper, Year Book, Literary Magazine, Radio Station; b. Business Managers of the Newspaper, Year Book, Literary Magazine, Radio Station; c. Student Court Judges (5); d. Any constitutional amendments.

March 8 & 9, 1972 — Elections for previously nominated offices.

March 15 & 16, 1972 — Nominations for the following offices: a. Student Legislature (excluding Freshman Representative and Commuter Representatives); b. 4 Student Senators by petition and 4 Faculty Senators by petition.

March 27 & 28, 1972 — Election of previously nominated offices.

—furnished by
SGA Elections
Committee

